

**Summary Minutes  
City of Sedona  
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting  
Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, Arizona  
Monday, June 23, 2014 – 11:00 a.m.**

**(5 minutes, 11:00 - 11:05 am for items 1 - 3)**

**1. Verification of notice, call to order, roll call**

Chair Unger verified proper notice and called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

**Roll Call:**

**Commissioners Present:** Chair Brynn Burkee Unger, Vice Chair Ann Jarmusch and Commissioners Catherine Coté, Allyson Holmes, Charlie Schudson and Steve Segner. Commissioner Jane Grams was excused.

**Staff Present:** Cari Meyer and Donna Puckett

**Council Liaison Present:** Dan McIlroy

**2. Commission and Staff announcements**

*There were no announcements.*

**3. Approval of the May 12, 2014 minutes**

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Coté moved to accept the minutes. Commissioner Holmes seconded the motion.*

Vice Chair Jarmusch and Commissioner Schudson noted that they have to abstain, because they were not in attendance.

**VOTE:** *Motion carried four (4) for, zero (0) opposed and two (2) abstentions. (Vice Chair Jarmusch and Commissioner Schudson abstained and Commissioner Grams was excused).*

**4. Discussion/possible direction regarding two buildings included in the Historic Resources Survey, #262 Cook House Biddles (110 Elk Road) and #260 Cook House Saddlerock (86 Saddlerock) both located on the site of a proposed Major Community Plan Amendment, Zone Change, and Development Review application (PZ 14-00007). A general description of the area includes but is not limited to the area south of W State Route 89A between Saddlerock Circle and Elk Road. The properties with the surveyed buildings are further identified as APN 408-26-008 and 408-26-010 (45 minutes, 11:05 am – 11:50 am)**

Cari Meyer explained that for the entire property between Saddlerock and Elk Road, south of S.R. 89A, those property owners have come together and submitted an application for a Major Community Plan Amendment, a Zone Change and a Development Review to build a new hotel and retail area. Today, we are to discuss the two properties within those boundaries that are included on the Historic Resources Survey, although they are not landmarked. Part of the application would be to demolish those structures to build their proposal.

Cari indicated that as part of this review process, we want to get the Commission's take on them based on the structures and what the survey says about them. You aren't making a formal recommendation today, but we hope you can determine whether or not you would like to further investigate them. We put this on the agenda, because the first round of comments is due this week and a number of other agencies have been reviewing them, and the Commission is entitled to review the historic structures on this property.

Staff hopes that the outcome of today would be either to decide to do nothing or decide to put forth a comment requesting access to the property for further investigation.. There won't be any formal recommendation today, but views on how to move forward regarding the surveyed structures.

**Commission's Comments, Questions and Concerns:**

- Question as to how this relates to the hearings today and Thursday at the Elk's Club. Cari explained that the Soldier Pass area is identified as a Community Focus Area, and Cynthia Lovely is having meetings with business and property owners about future expectations for the area to formulate a plan for the area as a whole, whereas, the Commission is looking specifically at the two buildings that have been surveyed.
- Question as to how those processes relate to this consortium of owners who are trying to interest people in hotel development. Cari explained that they are moving concurrently and are not related, but whatever comes out of the Community Focus Area planning, if adopted, would become part of the Community Plan to help guide future development of that area.
- Comment stressing that the Commission is only here to discuss the two buildings; however, Cari explained that as citizens of Sedona, staff is happy to meet with you individually and answer questions about the development outside of this setting, but from the Commission, we are looking for comments on the two structures.
- Question about which two structures these are, and Cari indicated they are referred to as the Cook House and Cook House-Saddlerock.
- Question as to if that is the original house or the guesthouse. Chair Unger indicated that it is both of them.
- Question as to which one is the Connelly's Market. Chair Unger indicated that the market wasn't there.
- Question as to if one is Saddlerock Barn. Chair Unger stated no.
- Comment that they are not easily visible from the highway.
- Question as to if the Commission has made a site visit there. Chair Unger indicated that is one of the things to discuss.

*Chair Unger indicated that Stephen Thompson and Donna Michaels had asked to address the Commission and opened the public comment period.*

**Stephen Thompson, Architect, Sedona, AZ:** Indicated that he has been involved in this project for a decade, with the intent of trying to do a comprehensive plan for those vacant properties. It has been a struggle with various owners over the years, but finally, the Biddle family became interested in selling and the developer who is in escrow to purchase the property is interested in the assemblage to total about 7.2 acres, which allows you to take a broader look at the structures.

Mr. Thompson indicated that this is in Community Focus Area 5 and there are seven aspirations, one of which is preservation of historic elements. There are two stone structures on the property and they are interesting looking -- both concrete block construction with stone veneer. One has a concrete floor and one has a partial red stone floor.

Mr. Thompson explained that first he looked at if it was feasible to retain them in the plan, and second was there anything significant that he could preserve or use in the project. He met with the client and indicated they are interesting houses, but he is not sure of their significance. They haven't been listed or investigated yet, but there are some interesting elements, including some of the stonework, woodwork, a fireplace mantle, steel windows, wooden doors and cabinetry, so he has developed a scheme to salvage and make use of some of those elements in the hotel lobby, which would become assets and a bit of character for the hotel. He looked at the prospect of integrating that, so in the broad brush sense, the lobby of the hotel will feel like a modern hotel lobby, but it will look like we saved something that might have been there, which is always an interesting scenario, and it seemed like an opportunity to take advantage of that.

In keeping with the spirit of CFA 5 and dealing with a bit of history, it is up to the Commission to decide if it is significant, but we have a vehicle in the project to preserve some of those elements, like a plaque if it is significant enough in the name, such as Cook's or whatever, to reference the site and how it was used, etc. Then, the use of the elements like the steel windows to create artifact architectural elements and perhaps have a picture library and reading room in the main lobby to attest to the history of the site. That is where he is coming from and he has done historic restorations before. He has listed projects on the register, both professionally and personally.

Mr. Thompson added that he took some pictures of a cursory survey on his laptop for the Commission to view. You can't see them up close, because they are totally shrouded with shrubs and trees, so the pictures are of the elements that he was interested in.

Commissioner Segner confirmed that they have been surveyed and Chair Unger asked staff if Nancy Burgess had surveyed these buildings. Cari Meyer indicated that she didn't know; however, Vice Chair Jarmusch added that the sheets from the survey say that she re-surveyed them in May.

Commissioner Segner then asked if the Commission has any authority over these buildings at this point, and Chair Unger explained that we don't have landmark authority. Cari added that the Commission can offer a recommendation if you would like to look at them further, to determine whether or not you want to recommend something.

Vice Chair Jarmusch asked about the 80-page report outlining this development proposal, which states on page 9, "Preserve historic resources -- after an inspection and analysis of the two existing red stone structures, it was determined that preservation isn't feasible, however, salvage might be", and Mr. Thompson indicated that he did a cursory survey, but this says there has been an inspection and analysis. Mr. Thompson explained that it is terminology; he wrote that and did the inspection from his perspective. The Vice Chair commented that she thought maybe Mr. Thompson and an engineer were there, and Mr. Thompson explained that the architect is the best person to do that.

The Vice Chair explained that she is suggesting that the Commission needs more information. Mr. Thompson agreed and indicated that they are here just to tell the Commission where they have come to date, and then it would be up to the Commission. Vice Chair Jarmusch then stated that the red flag for her was the words, "It was determined that preservation isn't feasible", and Mr. Thompson added, "Within the scheme of the project". The Vice Chair noted that the Commission likes to think there are opportunities to compromise and Mr. Thompson added, "As do I".

Mr. Thompson explained that that a detailed floor plan of the lobby was being passed around; however, Chair Unger interrupted to say that tearing down the building and putting things in the plan are not where the Commission is yet, although we may get there. Right now, we are at the stage of deciding whether or not we need to look at the structures more carefully, to determine if these buildings are something we want to preserve. We're only at the first step, so we're looking at understanding the history and significance of these buildings, rather than any future use of them -- that would be the next step. Cari agreed and explained that the Commission is now talking about if you believe the buildings warrant further investigation.

Commissioner Segner indicated he would like for the Commission to work to its authority and normally if somebody designated a house, it would be protected. These haven't been protected, so we really can't protect them; however, Chair Unger stated that actually the Commission can. The Commission's power is that we have made these surveys of 250-some structures; therefore, we can make a recommendation, because they are going to need some zoning changes, etc., for their project. The leverage is only to make suggestions to P&Z that this is something that is significant, and if we can say that the project can be altered to follow the Commission's recommendation, then the owner can have the option of having a Zone Change -- it is a give and take thing between the City and a developer, but that is the only leverage we have when a building is surveyed. We have the survey specifically for this purpose, when somebody wants to knock something down that we

think has significance, and if it encompasses a Zone Change, then we have some leverage -- it is only our recommendation.

Commissioner Schudson asked if the homes are occupied and Mr. Thompson indicated that the westernmost house is; the one in the southeast corner is vacant. Cari added that would be the Cook House-Saddlerock, #260 in the survey. The Commissioner then asked if that is owned by the Baney Corporation, and Cari indicated yes.

Vice Chair Jarmusch indicated that she didn't find the properties identified on the handout, and Mr. Thompson explained that this is coming late in their process. They had no definite documentation that there was to be this overlay, so the things you are seeing are in response to CFA 5 aspirations, and his recognition of a potential asset. If the Commission tells him there is something more significant there, he would love to hear about it and go from there.

Chair Unger noted that it is a little difficult to see where exactly they are located and that might be something that the Commission would like to have more information on. Commissioner Coté asked the Chair to talk about the significance of the Cook family, and Chair Unger referenced the Cook's Cemetery that is in the same area. Usually, more extensive research is done when the decision is being made to determine if we are going to landmark and for the National Register, and that hasn't been done with this property. There is some information about the person who was the stone mason for them, who did a lot of stonework here, and that research may be the other thing we want to do by going to the Sedona Historical Society to ask them for more information on this property. Realistically, this needed to come in front of the Commission before making the decision to spend time looking into those things, and today, we are asking the Commission to decide whether it is worth taking a longer look at this before it goes to the next phase. We aren't making a decision today, we are deciding what we think might need to be done to get more information.

Commissioner Segner indicated that the Commission has been asked to make a determination and nobody has looked at the buildings, so the obvious thing to do would be to see them, then we can make a decision based upon observation.

Mr. Thompson pointed out the location of the structures on an aerial. Councilor McIlroy asked the size of the footprint for the projected hotel, and Mr. Thompson indicated that the proposal is for 117 units as a mixed-use project with a hotel and some commercial entities, with two owners. Chair Unger suggested that they discuss the project after the meeting.

Mr. Thompson explained that from his perspective, he saw an opportunity for something to salvage, but if push comes to shove, the house in the southeast corner happens to be where a casita in one of the twin villas is located, and that could be one of those, so that is feasible. The other one is right in the heart of the site and would cause the whole thing to get twisted around. He also agrees that the stonework is exceptional, and they discussed the idea of saw-cutting panels of the stone out and somehow displaying them.

Commissioner Segner indicated that they were at the Purtymun house earlier, and he talked about the stonework there. This building has great stonework, so those structures should at least be photographed in detail, because they are unique buildings.

Commissioner Schudson asked if Mr. Thompson is going to be at the hearings this week, and Mr. Thompson indicated yes. Councilor McIlroy then asked if the owners want to save that house in the middle of the property or have it go. Mr. Thompson stated that it hasn't been discussed, and he is not sure it is the kind of house that you could lift up. It is concrete masonry block with stone veneer, and he is sure it is unreinforced with a piece of steel or grout anywhere in it; it would crumble. They are both concrete block structures, which attests to a certain period. To try to move either one, they are on slabs, so it would be hard to do.

Councilor McIlroy stated that the interest is the historical aspects of these houses and at this point, we don't know enough about them. Chair Unger agreed and indicated that more information is needed.

**Donna Michaels, Sedona, AZ:** Indicated she has been a Sedona resident for 22 years, and regarding the interest in these two buildings, a wonderful part has been the beginning discussions with the principals about the imaging and branding of their product, as it relates to early Sedona.

Commissioner Coté asked if she is one of the property owners, and Ms. Michaels explained that she is the community outreach person for the developers, so she is interpreting the Community Plan to the developers, so they can rise to the community's expectations and align with the Community Plan, as they move through the process. It is the first time ever, it has been done that way, so there has been a voiced and focused interest in attending to what, in the character of our community historically and the structures themselves, are important to this project, and that has been done and will continue to be as they move forward.

The Chair indicated that the Commission would now continue its conversation about where they go from here, and noted that Commissioner Segner had indicated that the Commission needs more information before going forward. Earlier we were discussing the stone vernacular building style that we like to recognize, but we don't have that much information on these buildings. We know that they are on the survey, and she is grateful for Nancy Burgess's notice, although she doesn't say much about them.

*Donna Puckett asked for the record, if the public comment period was closed and Chair Unger indicated yes.*

Commissioner Coté indicated that her understanding is that if there is significance for the buildings, it is because of the stonework primarily and its representation of the vernacular style in its era, but not related to the person necessarily. Chair Unger explained that it could be, because the person who lived there actually developed that vernacular for the City. He did a lot of the work, but that is something that we have to look at closer.

Commissioner Segner suggested cutting to the quick; the Commission owes it to itself to do a field trip to educate us a little bit, and then we can at least say to the City Council that we took the time to do the job. Chair Unger agreed and added that the Sedona Historical Society can also be asked for more information.

Commissioner Coté asked about Cari's comment that decisions have to be made this week, and Cari clarified that it wasn't decisions. Comments have to be provided to the applicant, so if you want to request a site visit, we have to get permission from the property owner to look at the buildings, so if that is something the Commission wants in addition to more research, then that would be your comments. Then, we would try to work with the property owner to see if we can get access to the site and see what other information can be found.

Chair Unger asked about the need for a motion, and Cari indicated that the Commission can direct staff to provide comments to the applicant, and list them. Chair Unger indicated that there seems to be consensus to have a site visit and gathering more historic information, and then asked if there was any objection; no objection was voiced.

Cari Meyer indicated that would be on a future agenda and once it is all scheduled and the information is gathered, you can possibly offer a formal recommendation. Commissioner Coté pointed out that there is only one meeting left this summer -- in July; however, Chair Unger pointed out that a special meeting could be called, if necessary.

Councilor McIlroy asked who is going to do the research on the Cook family for historical significance. Vice Chair Jarmusch volunteered and Donna Puckett indicated that Audree or Cari will address that later.

Commissioner Segner suggested that the builder should do some research on the history of the Cook family and the property, as part of their solution. Cari explained that it can be part of your comments in requesting additional information. Commissioner Schudson voiced the concern that some people who might oppose the project would question our objectivity if we delegate it to the developer. Chair Unger agreed and Commissioner Segner noted that is a good point. Donna Puckett noted examples in the past, such as with the Telegraph Station, where the applicant provided some information, but the Commission still had the responsibility to do research.

Commissioner Schudson then asked about the historical society, and Chair Unger explained that the Commission uses the historical society as one of its sources, plus the county, etc. Commissioner Holmes asked if there are still some Cook family members around, and the Chair indicated that she isn't sure.

Commissioner Schudson asked about the timetable, and Cari indicated that the evaluation needs to be done sooner than later, because of the way it is moving through the process. Chair Unger noted that the Commission has a meeting in July, so if we can have a site visit before the meeting, it would be great, and it can be on the agenda for that meeting. Donna Puckett suggested perhaps having the site visit at 2:30 p.m. before the meeting, and Cari noted that staff will have to talk with the property owner.

Commissioner Holmes noted that there is a lady that works in the District Office for the School District named JoAnn Cook, who is married to a Cook. Chair Unger suggested that Commissioner Holmes get that information to Audree Juhlin or Cari Meyer.

Donna Puckett suggested that the Commissioners let staff know their unavailable dates, between now and the next meeting, in case July 14th doesn't work, so we know that we have a quorum. Commissioner Holmes and Commissioner Coté indicated that they will not be available that week, and Commissioner Coté announced that she is moving and this will be her last meeting. Commissioner Schudson and Commissioner Segner indicated that they will be available.

Vice Chair Jarmusch indicated that it would be nice to see the interior, since Mr. Thompson has identified elements that he might salvage and reuse. Mr. Thompson indicated that if the lady is home, she will take the Commission in.

Cari Meyer summarized that the Commission is requesting a site visit and additional information about both the property and the family. Vice Chair Jarmusch added that the Commission is also requesting to go inside. Councilor McIlroy asked if the site visit will be on the 14th and Chair Unger indicated that we will find out from Audree Juhlin.

**5. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items (5 minutes, 11:50-11:55 am)**

For the July 14th meeting, Cari indicated that the Commission would have a discussion about the planned site visit. Chair Unger suggested that Commissioner Coté do a written report about the conference, because she would like to discuss what was learned at the HP Conference. Additionally, there should be a discussion about today's site visit to the Purtymun house, so she will contact Audree and Donna about that.

Donna Puckett summarized that the agenda is to include the Purtymun house site visit, the upcoming site visit before the meeting, and a discussion about the HP Conference.

Commissioner Coté added that she plans to follow-through on her commitments, one of which was to create a new Commissioner packet, so she will submit that to the Chair and Audree Juhlin, in case you want that on the agenda also, but if it isn't done for the next meeting, it will definitely be completed for the following meeting. Chair Unger suggested tentatively adding that information for a short discussion. Commissioner Coté then indicated that another commitment was to get information from a couple of cities regarding their grant programs, so she has information from Flagstaff and Bisbee, and she will email that also. Donna Puckett indicated that staff can see if we have Commissioner Coté's information the week the agenda is to be posted, and if not, we will wait.

Chair Unger noted that the Commission is not having a meeting in August.

**6. Adjournment (11:55 am)**

The Chair called for adjournment at approximately 11:50 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the actions of the Historic Preservation Commission in the meeting held on June 23, 2014.

---

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

---

Date